

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-9 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 3-6 and 9 are amended and claim 2 is canceled with prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiners Husar and Han in the April 12 interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1-2 and 5-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dewald (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0008470) in view of Oe (U.S. Patent No. 5,863,113); rejects claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dewald in view of Oe, and further in view of Hansen (U.S. Patent No. 3,622,231); and rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dewald in view of Oe, and further in view of Waymouth (U.S. Patent No. 4,895,420). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

In particular, neither Dewald nor Oe, individually or in combination, discloses or suggests an end surface of an outer periphery of an emerging-end opening, which is on a plane that is substantially perpendicular to a central axis of the rod integrator and being a scattering surface or a blaze surface that reflects the incident light from a color wheel on the end surface toward the central axis of the rod integrator, as recited in independent claim 1.

Dewald at Fig. 6 and its supporting disclosure at paragraph [0038]-[0040], discloses that a light that strikes a mirror on an exit face 306 travels back through the integrator rod 300 again. See paragraph [0040]. In other words, Dewald is referring to light 614 that reflects off an inner surface of the exit face 306 (see Fig. 6), and thus does not disclose or suggest an end surface...that reflects the incident light from the color wheel. Moreover, Dewald does not

disclose or suggest that the incident light from the color wheel on the end surface is reflected towards the central axis of the rod integrator.

Oe, on the other hand, discloses at Figs. 6(a) and 6(b) an example of prisms that reflect light at a predetermined direction. See col. 6, line 66-col. 7, line 10. However, Oe discloses that the prisms are disposed at the inner surface of the light guide 1. See Fig. 4. Thus, Oe does not disclose or suggest an end surface...that reflects the incident light from the color wheel. In fact, this feature is not possible with Oe because Oe's apparatus does not even have a color wheel.

Neither Hansen nor Waymouth compensate for the above-noted deficiencies of Oe and Dewald.

Hansen discloses in Fig. 2 that optics 2-14 may have increasing heights as they are situated further from the focal point 40. Waymouth discloses that a reflector can have reflectance of greater than 95%.


Therefore, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter. Claims 3-9 depend on independent claim 1, and therefore also define patentable subject matter as well as for the other features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1 and 3-9 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,


James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Yong S. Choi
Registration No. 43,324

JAO:YSC/eks

Attachment:

Request for Continued Examination

Date: April 13, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--